

# Milbank

**DANIEL M. PERRY**

*Partner*

55 Hudson Yards | New York, NY 10001-2163

T: 212.530.5083

dperry@milbank.com | milbank.com

August 6, 2021

**VIA ECF**

The Honorable Sarah Netburn  
United States District Court for the Southern District of New York  
40 Foley Square  
New York, NY 10007

Re: *Global Gaming Philippines, LLC v. Razon Jr., et al.*, No. 21-cv-2655 (LGS)-(SN)

Dear Judge Netburn:

On behalf of all the Defendants in the above-captioned matter, we write with respect to the hearing that was held on August 4, 2021 regarding the three letter motions to compel Plaintiff filed by Defendants Mr. Razon and the Real Estate Entities (Dkt. No. 102), the Energy Entities (Dkt. No. 103) and BRHI and SPI (Dkt. No. 104), respectively, and Plaintiff's letter motion to compel Mr. Razon (Dkt. No. 112).

During the August 4 hearing, the Court heard oral argument with respect to nearly all of the issues raised by the letter motions to compel filed by Plaintiff, but ran out of time to hear oral argument with respect to any of the three letter motions to compel filed by Defendants, and Plaintiff claimed that it had additional issues that it wanted to raise with respect to its letter motion to compel Mr. Razon. At the end of the hearing, the Court indicated that it would either schedule another hearing for oral argument with respect to these letter motions to compel and/or rule on these letter motions in a written decision.<sup>1</sup>

With respect to the letter motion to compel Mr. Razon (Dkt. No. 112), Mr. Razon requests an opportunity to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding the outstanding issues that Plaintiff has before the Court rules on that motion and proposes that the parties include in their joint status letter to the Court due August 20, 2021 any issues that remain unresolved.

In Plaintiff's response letter to the Defendants' letter motions to compel (Dkt. No. 125), Plaintiff made a number of misrepresentations of facts and law that Defendants have not yet had an opportunity to respond to either orally or in writing. This is particularly the case with respect to

---

<sup>1</sup> See August 4, 2021 Hr'g Tr. 60:15-18 ("THE COURT: . . . I know that there remain the motions that the defendant entities have submitted. I may be able to address that in a written ruling. If not, I will schedule oral argument later on with respect to those applications.").

MILBANK LLP

NEW YORK | LOS ANGELES | WASHINGTON, D.C. | SÃO PAULO | FRANKFURT  
LONDON | MUNICH | BEIJING | HONG KONG | SEOUL | SINGAPORE | TOKYO

The Honorable Sarah Netburn  
August 6, 2021

Page 2

Plaintiff's response to Defendants BRHI's and SPI's letter motion to compel, wherein Plaintiff spent roughly nine pages of its 15-page response letter to all three motions attempting to obtain, what is in effect, a dispositive ruling on one of BRHI's and SPI's defenses to enforcement of the arbitration awards. Defendants are mindful of the burden that the parties have imposed on the Court's time related to their discovery disputes. BRHI and SPI therefore respectfully request that the Court provide BRHI and SPI with an opportunity to respond with a very short oral presentation to the Court or in a reply letter not to exceed three pages in response to Plaintiff's 9-page response to BRHI and SPI's 5-page motion to compel.

The Energy Entities also respectfully request that the Court provide them with an opportunity to respond to Plaintiff's response letter with a very short oral presentation to the Court or in a reply letter not to exceed one page.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Daniel M. Perry

Daniel M. Perry